

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 SERGEY MKHITARYAN,
6 Plaintiff(s),
7 v.
8 COUNTY OF CLARK,
9 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-00708-RFB-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 43]

10 On June 2, 2025, the Court denied Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel. Docket No. 42.
11 On June 25, 2025, Plaintiff filed another motion to appoint counsel, Docket No. 43, which the
12 Court construes as a motion for reconsideration.

13 "Reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly." *Koninklijke Philips*
14 *Elecs. N.V. v. KXD Tech., Inc.*, 245 F.R.D. 470, 472 (D. Nev. 2007) (citation and internal
15 quotations omitted). The Local Rules provide the applicable standards in addressing whether the
16 Court should reconsider an interlocutory order, indicating that reconsideration may be appropriate
17 if (1) there is newly discovered evidence that was not available when the original motion or
18 response was filed, (2) the Court committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust,
19 or (3) there is an intervening change in controlling law. Local Rule 59-1(a). A motion for
20 reconsideration may not repeat arguments already presented. Local Rule 59-1(b).

21 Grounds for reconsideration have not been shown.

22 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: June 27, 2025

25
26 
27 Nancy J. Koppe
28 United States Magistrate Judge